



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

July 2005

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PRACTICE GROUP  
P.O. BOX 55874  
BOSTON, MA 02205

AUG 26 2005

In re Application of:  
CHIEN-PING HUANG : DECISION ON PETITION TO  
Serial No.: 10/787,269 : MAKE SPECIAL UNDER 37  
Filed: 25 February 2004 : C.F.R. § 1.102(d)  
Docket: 58102-DIV (71987) :  
Title: SEMICONDUCTOR PACKAGE WITH HEAT :  
DISSIPATING STRUCTURE :

This is a decision on the petition filed on March 8, 2005, to make the above-identified application special under the accelerated examination procedure set forth in MPEP § 708.02(VIII) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.102(d).

The petition to make the application special is **DISMISSED**.

In support of the petition, petition provides: a) the applicable petition fee; b) a statement that all claims are directed to a single invention, and that any election later required will be made without traverse; c) a statement that a pre-examination search was made, including the search areas; and d) a discussion of the teaching of some of the references.

For accelerated examination under MPEP § 708.02(VIII) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.102(d), a showing of the following is required: a) a petition to make special accompanied by the applicable petition fee; b) all claims are directed to a single invention; c) a statement that a pre-examination search was made, including the search areas; d) a copy of each of the references deemed most closely related to the claimed subject matter; and e) a detailed discussion of the references pointing out with the particularity required by 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and (c), how the claimed subject matter is distinguishable over the references.

The requirements of MPEP § 708.02(VIII)(a), (c), and (d) are considered to have been met. However, petitioner fails to point out with the particularity required by 37 CFR § 1.111 (b) and (c), how the claimed subject matter is distinguishable over the *each* of the references. Therefore, petitioner fails to meet the requirement of MPEP § 708.02(VIII)(e).

37 CFR § 1.111 (b) states "[a] general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section." 37 CFR § 1.111 (c) states in part "the applicant or patent owner must clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made."


Petitioner presents a summary of the invention. Petitioner presents a detailed discussion of the supplied references. However, a detailed discussion of how each of the references overcomes *each* of the independent claims is required for the petition to be granted. For example, in the discussion of the Lai reference, petitioner states that Lai does not teach or suggest "any gold wires...outside the area covered by the heat sink." While this is directed towards the limitations of claim 1, which require the conductive elements to extend outside the area covered by the heat sink, claim 29 does not require this limitation. Consequently, petitioner has not provided a detailed discussion how the language of claim 29 patentably distinguishes itself from the Lai reference.

While Technology Center Directors may have granted petitions that do not comply with the detailed discussion requirement of the Accelerated Examination procedure, Technology Center Director decisions on petitions are not binding precedent of the Patent Examining Corps, and the application of an improper standard in certain cases does not require the Office to continue to apply the improper standard in all cases. *See In re The Boulevard Entertainment, Inc.*, 334 F.3d 1336, 1343, 67 USPQ2d 1475, 1480 (Fed. Cir. 2003)).

For the above-mentioned reasons, the petition is dismissed. The application will therefore be taken up by the examiner for action in its regular turn.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within 2 (two) months of the date of this decision in order to be considered timely. Any resubmission of the petition must address each of the independent claims, and provide a detailed discussion of how each of the independent claims is not met by each of the references presented as relevant.

Any inquiry regarding this decision should be directed to Hien H. Phan, Special Program Examiner, at (571) 272-1606.



Hien H. Phan, Special Program Examiner  
Technology Center 2800 - Semiconductors,  
Electrical & Optical Systems & Components